

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1973

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 26 1978

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD, Appellant

78-5631

vs

MICHAEL RODAK, JR., Clerk U.S.S.C.T., Appellee

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS  
BY APPELLANT 29 .S.C.S. 1915(a); S CT Rule 53(1)

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD respectfully moves the Court for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis, in accordance with the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 1915, and Rule 53 of the Rules of this Court. The affidavit of the appellant HAJJI A.R. AHMAD in support of this motion is hereto attached.

Presented herewith is a Jurisdictional Statement presented for filing pursuant to S CT Rule 53 (2) of the applicant.

DATED OCTOBER 26, 1978

Respectfully submitted,

*Hajji A.R. Ahmad*

Hajji A.R. Ahmad  
5538 W. Thompson St  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19131

PROOF OF SERVICE

215-877-7452

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD, appellant, being first duly sworn deposes and says :

1. I have delivered by hand copy of this motion to the appellee at the office of the Clerk of The S CT One 1st St N.E. Washington, D.C. October 26, 1978 and to the U.S. Attorney for the District Of Columbia Rm 3136 C Fed Ct Hse Bldg 3rd & Constitution Aves, N.W. Washington, D.C.

Sworn and Subscribed :

NOTARY: *Oct 26 5, 1978*

*Raymond B Fenerty*

RAYMOND B. FENERTY

NOTARY PUBLIC, PHILADELPHIA, PHILADELPHIA CO  
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JUNE 14, 1980

*Hajji A.R. Ahmad*

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD  
5538 W. Thompson St  
Philadelphia, Penna 19131

215-877-7452

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1978

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

78-5631

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD, Appellant

vs

MICHAEL RODAK, JR, Appellee

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE  
TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS  
28 U.S.C.S. 1915(a); S CT Rule 53(1)

State of Pennsylvania  
County of Philadelphia

SS

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD, being duly sworn, on oath deposes and says:

1. He is the appellant in the above-entitled action and makes this affidavit in support of his motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein.  
2. Affiant is unable because of his poverty to pay fees and costs of this case or give security therefor.  
3. This is an appeal from a final judgement/order of October 5, 1978 in which appellant was denied motion for reconsideration of an order of the District Court For The District Of Columbia denying a motion for an injunction to compel the defendant Michael Rodak, Jr Clerk of The Supreme Court Of The U.S. to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff who having complied fully with all of the applicable requirements of S CT Rule 53(1)&(2) is deprived of the benefits of the duty imposed upon the defendant under S CT Rule 53.3). The pliffs are citizens of Egypt and citizens of Pennsylvania who were forced to flee the Middle East in Nov 1956 as a result of the Zionist conspiracy to colonize Palestine and nited States participation therein and aid thereto being aid to an expedition against a people with whom the U.S. is at peace in violation of 13 .S.C.960, et al., statutes made pursuant to the authority of Article I, Sec 8, Clause 10, U.S. Constitution. This action is brought under 28 .S.C. 1350. This case raises substantial questions of constitutional law as more fully set forth in appellants' jurisdictional Statement filed herewith. Affiant believes that he is entitled to the redress sought in this Court.

Subscribed and sworn to before  
me this 26th day of October, 1978.

NOTARY: *Raymond B. Fenerty*

RAYMOND B. FENERTY

NOTARY PUBLIC, PHILADELPHIA, PHILADELPHIA CO.  
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JUNE 14, 1980

*Hajji A.R. Ahmad*  
Hajji A.R. Ahmad

5538 W. Thompson St  
Phila., Pa., 19131  
215-877-7452

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1978

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

78-5631

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD, Appellant

vs

MICHAEL RODAK, JR, Clerk U.S.  
S. CT., appellee

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD

Pro se

5538 W. Thompson St  
Philadelphia, Penna 19131

215-877-7452

#### THE OPINIONS BELOW

October 5, 1978, the District Court filed an order denying plaintiffs motion for reconsideration of the order of the court of Aug 25, 1978 denying injunctive relief and dismissing the action. The order stated, "Upon consideration of plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the court's sua sponte dismissal of this action, said motion dated Sept 1, 1978 but received in court on Sept 19, 1978, it is by the court this 5th day of Oct 1978, ORDERED that plaintiff's motion is hereby denied both on the merits and because it is out of time."

#### JURISDICTION

This statement is presented by the appellant in support of Jurisdiction by the Supreme Court of The United States on appeal and to show that substantial federal questions are presented. This appeal is taken pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1252. The appellee is a federal officer of the United States. The appeal is also authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1254(1) which permits review by the Supreme Court of The United States before decision of cases on appeal where a question of such imperative public importance is presented as to justify deviation from normal processes of appellate procedure. This case was docketed with the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit October 26, 1978. The order appealed from is a final order denying applicant's motion for reconsideration of the court's order of 8/25/78 which denied plaintiff's motion for an injunction to compel the defendant, Michael Rodak, Jr., Clerk of The U.S. Supreme Court, to place the case on the docket and file the documents submitted on two occasions for docketing by the plaintiff of July 8 and 21, 1978, and dismissing sua sponte the action. The Notice of Appeal from the Aug 25, 1978 Order was filed Sep 19, 1978 and the Notice of appeal from the order of the Court of 10/5/78 was filed Oct 26, 1978. The Notice was filed in The U.S. District Court for D.C.

Cases believed to sustain the jurisdiction of the court are:

UNITED STATES, Petitioner v The Steamer Three Friends, her engines, etc., Napoleon B. Broward and Montcalm Broward, claimants, decided March 1, 1897; 166 U.S. 1, 63, 66.

1 Moore's Federal Practice § 75; Alien jurisdiction.

Title 18 U.S.C. 960 is one statute involved in this question. It provides: "Whoever, within the United States, knowingly begins or sets on foot or provides or prepares a means for or furnishes the money for, or takes part in, any military or naval expedition or enterprise to be carried on from thence against the territory or dominion of any foreign prince or state, or of any colony, district, or people with whom the United States is at peace shall be fined not more than \$3,000.00 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."

Also, The Establishment Clause of the First Amendment which provides, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or abridging the free exercise thereof.

The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, "nor shall property be taken (private) for public use with compensation and/or due process of law."

#### Questions Presented.

1. Aid to Israel from public and private sources violates Article I, Sec 8, clauses 1, 3, 8, 10 & 18 U.S. Constitution.
2. The plaintiffs are not responsible for the untimely filing of the Sept 1st motion and is entitled to the relief demanded in the motion.

Aug 22, 1978, the Appellant herein filed civil action 78-1584 in the District Court for the District of Columbia and brought the action on behalf of all parties seeking to have their appeal presented before the S. CT in the cases presented in the Jurisdictional Statement submitted for filing on July 8 & 21, 1978. The plaintiffs represented are citizens of Egypt and citizens of Pennsylvania who were forced to flee the middle East and enter the U.S. as refugees in Nov 1956. Plaintiffs cite the agreement entered into at Basle Switzerland 1897 by members of the Jewish Faith to infiltrate and colonize Palestine a Muslim state and or people with whom the U.S. is at peace. June 30, 1922 the U.S. Congress adopted a resolution to use the good offices of the U.S. to open the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration and colonization. Plaintiffs bring this action under 28 U.S.C. 1350 for injuries sustained resulting from the violations of the law of nations. Plaintiffs allege that the acts of the defendant named herein was intended to and does in fact operate to provide aid to Israel at the expense of the plaintiffs in violation of Section 1350 and 18 U.S.C. 960, et al. The district Court abused its discretion by dismissing the case and denying plaintiffs application for injunctive relief.

Appended to this statement as one appendix is the copy of the Order of the Court of Aug 25 with the Memorandum Opinion and the Order of October 5, 1978. Also copy of the Notice of Appeal filed Sept 19, 1978 and copy of the Notice of Appeal filed October 26, 1978.

#### Conclusion

In consideration of the foregoing, Appellant submits that this appeal brings before the court substantial and important questions which require plenary consideration with briefs on the merits and oral argument for their resolution and that this court should expedite this case by advancing it on the calendar for noting probable jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD  
Appellant, pro se

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

AUG 25 1978

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD

Plaintiff

v.

MICHAEL RODAK, JR.

Defendant

:  
:  
:  
:  
:

JAMES F. DAVEY, Clerk

Civil Action No. 78-1584

EXHIBIT N

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff's "Affidavit in Support of Motion for Restraining Order Without Notice to Adverse Party" alleges that "[t]hese documents [jurisdictional statements and supporting documents] ... in form and content comply substantially with the Rules of the Supreme Court." Plaintiff's own allegations make it clear that he is not entitled to the principal relief sought, an order directing defendant to place plaintiff's appeal on the Supreme Court docket. Substantial compliance provides an insufficient basis for the Court to grant any of the requested relief. Accordingly, this case must be dismissed.

An appropriate order is entered herewith.

JUNE L. GREEN  
U.S. District Judge

Dated: August 25, 1978

FILED

AUG 25 1978

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JAMES F. DAVEY, Clerk

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD

Plaintiff

v.

MICHAEL RODAK, JR.

Defendant

:  
:  
:  
:  
:

Civil Action No. 78-1584

EXHIBIT O

ORDER

Upon consideration of plaintiff's request for money damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, affidavits and memorandum of law, and it appearing that plaintiff is not entitled to the relief requested, it is by the Court this 25<sup>th</sup> day of August 1978,

ORDERED, sua sponte, that this action be dismissed.

JUNE L. GREEN



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HAJJI A. R. AHMAD :  
Plaintiff :  
v. : Civil Action No. 78-1584  
MICHAEL RODAK, JR. :  
Defendant :  
OCT 5 1978

FILED

ORDER

JAMES F. DAVEY, Clerk

Upon consideration of plaintiff's motion for permission to file notices of appeal to the United States Supreme Court and to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit without payment of any filing fees, it is by the Court this 5<sup>th</sup> day of October 1978,

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion is hereby denied.

JUNE L. GREEN  
U.S. District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HAJJI A. R. AHMAD :  
Plaintiff :  
v. : Civil Action No. 78-1584  
MICHAEL RODAK, JR. :  
Defendant :  
OCT 5 1978

EXHIBIT 2

FILED

ORDER

JAMES F. DAVEY, Clerk

Upon consideration of plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the Court's sua sponte dismissal of this action, said motion dated September 1, 1978 but received in Court on September 19, 1978, it is by the Court this 5<sup>th</sup> day of October 1978,

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion is hereby denied both on the merits and because it is out of time.

JUNE L. GREEN  
U.S. District Judge

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED  
Oct. 26, 1978  
(confirmed by  
telephone)

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD,

CIVIL CLASS ACTION NO.

plaintiff

73-1534

vs

MICHAEL RODAK, JR., Clerk U.S.  
S.Ct., defendant

PLFF'S NOTICE OF APPEAL TO THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE FINAL ORDER OF THIS  
COURT DENYING PLFFS MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
FILED OCTOBER 5, 1973

Notice is hereby given that HAJJI A.R. AHMAD, plaintiff, on his own behalf and on behalf of the class represented by him in this action, appeals to the Supreme Court Of The United States From the Order of this Court Filed October 5, 1978 which denied plff's motion to reconsider the Aug 25, 1973 order of this Court which denied plffs application for an injunction and dismissed the action.

This appeal is taken as a matter of right pursuant to Rules 3 & 4, F.R.A.P. and pursuant to 28 U.S.C.S. 1252 and 1291. Also pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1254(1), which permits review of cases pending before judgement where it is shown that the case is of imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellate processes and to require immediate settlement.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED BY THIS APPEAL ARE :

1. Plffs citizens of Egypt and citizens of the State Of Pennsylvania were forced to evacuate the middle east and Beirut Lebanon Nov 1956. Plffs allege that the conspiracy by Zionist to colonize Palestine since 1397 and U.S. participation in that conspiracy beginning with a resolution adopted June 30, 1922 to use the good offices of the United States to open the doors of Palestine to Jewish colonization and immigration. Various treaties have been recently enacted to promote this purpose. Plffs object to Muslim tax dollars being used for armament and support of Israel and maintain that this is recognition of an establishment of religion and violates the first Amendment of the U.S. Constitution in that it entangles the government in religion, supports one religion over another, forces Muslims to adopt recognition of Israel's right to Palestine under force of laws provided by and from within the United States contrary to Title 18 U.S.C. Sections 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960 et al., the Neutrality Laws all in violation of Article I, Sec 3, Clause 1, 3, 8, 10 & 18, U.S. Constitution. This conspiracy results in Muslims being deprived of property, life, liberty, religious and political, civil rights without compensation and due process of law. The Fourteenth Amendment is violated in that this is state action which denies equal protection of the law to a class of citizens for domestic political considerations favoring the Jews and the Jewish economic and political power. Title 28 U.S.C. 1350 provides a cause of action for violations sustained from violations of the law of nations. The Plaintiffs are being denied due process and other fundamental constitutional rights such as access to the Supreme Court Of The United States. Plffs seek a declaratory judgement that such participation by the United States in the conspiracy to colonize Palestine is unconstitutional and that the acts complained of in this case are acts committed in furtherance of the Zionist conspiracy and entitles the plaintiffs to damages.

2. The District Court in its order of Oct 5th, 1973, denied plaintiffs motion for reconsideration both on the merits, and because the motion was untimely filed. Petitioner seeks a declaratory judgement that the plaintiff is not responsible for the untimely filing and is entitled to the relief demanded, on the basis of the record.

PROOF OF SERVICE

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD, plaintiff, being duly sworn according to law deposes and says:

1. I have personally caused to be delivered a copy of this notice to the defendant on Oct 26, 1978 at the Office of The Clerk, One 1st St N.E. Washington, D.C.

FILED Oct 26, 1973

*Raymond B. Fenerty*  
NOTARY:

RAYMOND B. FENERTY  
NOTARY PUBLIC, PHILADELPHIA, PHILADELPHIA CO.  
MY C. OF LIC. EXPIRES JUNE 14, 1980

*Hajji A. R. Ahmad*  
HAJJI A.R. AHMAD

5538 W. Thompson St

Philadelphia, Penna 19131

215-877-7452

# **supplemental brief**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1978

NO. 78-5631

RECEIVED

DEC 15 1978

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

HAJJI A.R. AHMAD,  
Appellant,

VS

MICHAEL RODAK, JR., Clerk U.S. S. CT,  
Appellee,

*TO*  
~~MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT JURISDICTIONAL~~  
~~STATEMENT AND SUPPLEMENT~~

Hajji A.R. Ahmad  
5538 W. Thompson St  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19131



TO: THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE AND ASSOCIATE JUSTICES  
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Appellant respectfully moves this Court for permission to supplement his jurisdictional statement with facts and details of a new case, *infra*, undecided when this appeal was docketed on the 26th day of October, 1978.

DATED: December 14, 1978

Hajji A.R. Ahmad  
5538 W. Thompson St  
Philadelphia, Pa., 19131

TO: MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE  
UNITED STATES

On the 1st day of December, 1978, The United States Court Of Appeals For The District Of Columbia Circuit, in the matter of; HAJJI A.R. AHMAD, Petitioner, No. 78-8086, September Term, 1978, Civil Action No. 78-1584, Before: McGowan and Robb, Circuit Judges; an order which a copy of is attached hereto located in the attached Jurisdictional Statement Supplement Exhibit A, page 1, did file DENIED petitioner's motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus *in forma pauperis*, without stating any grounds for said denial and none appear.

On December 15, 1978, the petitioner filed with said Court:

1. Notice Of Appeal To The Supreme Court Of The United States.
2. Petition For Rehearing Under Rule 40, of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure with Affidavits and Exhibits A, B, C & D, all of which are appended hereto as: "Jurisdictional Statement Supplement Exhibits A, B, C & D. Each Exhibit, A, B, C & D, is numbered with a circled handwritten number in the TOP RIGHT HAND CORNER OF EACH PAGE, each Exhibit has a page 1, 2, etc., and may be cited as Supplement Exhibit A, B or C as the case may be, page 2, etc.

The Order Of The Court Of Appeals (3rd Cir.) Dec. 1, 1978:

1. Supports the Jurisdiction of this Court. Section 1252, Title 28, United States Code, provides in part; "A party who has received notice of appeal under this section shall take any subsequent appeal or cross appeal to the Supreme Court. All appeals or cross appeals taken to other courts prior to such notice shall be ~~not~~ treated as taken directly to the Supreme Court."

Section 1291, Title 28, United States Code provides, "The courts of appeals shall have jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions on the district courts of the United States, ..... except where a direct review may be had in the Supreme Court."

2. Conflicts with the Order of The United States Court Of Appeals For The Third Circuit, of June 16, 1978, which order granted the appellant herein, leave to proceed in appeal *in forma pauperis*.
3. represents error in that it affirms the decision of the lower court which failed to recognize the presence of the factors necessary to warrant the requested writ. Those factors are set forth in The Jurisdictional Statement Supplement Exhibit A, pages 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32.
4. Draws into question those Federal Statutes which are attached with the FULL TEXT, which were presented to the Court in support of applicant's request for a writ, said statutes are located in the Jurisdictional Statement Supplement Exhibit C, pages 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, and/or the constitutionality of the actions described on pages 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, and proof of the allegations made above is beginning on page 121 to 152.

5. conflicts with and unconstitutionally differs with the United States Tax Court's treatment of the petitioner. On December 8, 1978, said Court, issued an Order And Order To Show Cause Under Rule 91(f) ,in the case of Orlando R. Allen vs Commissioner Of Internal Revenue, Docket No., 11352-77, a copy of said Order Attached and is located at Jurisdictional Statement Supplement Exhibit B (D) ,page 1.

6. leaves unprotected the petitioner's First Amendment Rights. Jurisdictional Statement Exhibits A & B, contain nearly thirty court orders issued between June 1975 and this date, 1978, all are blocked from the Supreme Court Of The United States.

The Petitioner believes that this Court should grant this request because:

1. a substantial federal question is presented herewith of great public importance, such as to require briefs on the merits and oral argument for its resolution.

2. S CT Rules provide at 16, paragraph 5. "Any party may file a supplemental brief at any time while a jurisdictional statement is pending calling attention to new cases or legislation or other intervening matter not available at the time of his last filing."

3. Petitioner believes that he is entitled to the relief requested the same as white person. The fact the Benders Federal Forms (Procedural) publishes form no 5049, indicates that such leave is regularly granted to others and petitioners respectfully demand like treatment as negros under Section 1981, Title 42, United States Code.

4. with the filing of the Petition For Rehearing under Rule 40, FRAP, Dec 15, 1978, the petitioner has exhausted all remedies and in fact has no adequate remedy at law and is entitled to judgement on the merits based on the facts and the law presented herewith.

5. both the Notice of Appeal to the Supreme Court Filed Dec 15, 1978, and the Petition For Rehearing under Rule 40, FRAP, and this request for leave to supplement while the jurisdictional statement are are timely filed.

6. the appellants associates and coreligionist are deprived of constitutional protection and will suffer from the impairment of their First Amendment Rights in being denied access to the Courts particularly the Supreme Court Of The United States and they have no other means of getting their petition to this Court except by their signature below.

THE FOREGOING STATEMENT IS TRUE.

Respectfully submitted,

*the estate of mohamad  
ibn Ahmad Ahmad*  
THE ESTATE OF MOHAMMAD ALI  
IBN AHMAD (Deceased), Administrator,  
Hajji A.R. Ahmad  
5538 W. Thompson St.  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131  
215-877-7452

*the registered foreign agents  
Hajji A.R. Ahmad*  
THE REGISTERED FOREIGN AGENTS,  
Trustee, Hajji A.R. Ahmad  
5538 W. Thompson St  
Phila., Pa 19131

*lynn hope*  
BANDLEADER LYNN HOPE & HIS  
ORCHESTRA, 5538 W. Thompson St  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131

*Abdullah Y. Ali*  
ABDULLAH Y. ALI

*Hakim Ali*  
HAKIM ALI

*Izette Davis*  
IZETTE DAVIS

*Abdullah Ali (Orlando R. Allen)*  
ABDULLAH ALI (ORLANDO R. ALLEN)

*Yusef Ali Ibn Ahmad*  
YUSEF ALI IBN AHMAD

*Daoud Ibn Ahmad*  
DAOUD IBN AHMAD

AND NOW, COMES PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT,  
HAJJI A.R. AHMAD, STILL SWORN SAYS:

1. The Address of each of the above is: 5538 W. Thompson St., Phila., Pa 19131; 215-877-7452.
2. I have written, legal authorization to attachd each of the above signatures and to execute this affidavit.
3. Copies of said authorization is filed In The U.S. Dist Ct (EDPA), Oct 18, 1977, In Civil Action 77-327, Ahmad v Burke, et al.

SWORN & SUBSCRIBED BEFORE NOTARY:  
*December 14, 1978*  
*Raymond B. Fenerty*

RAYMOND B. FENERTY  
NOTARY PUBLIC, PHILADELPHIA, PHILADELPHIA CO.  
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JUNE 14, 1980

*the Capital Executive Syndicate  
Hajji A.R. Ahmad*  
"THE UNDERSIGNED" *the Capital Executive*  
Syndicate, Hajji A.R. Ahmad  
THE CAPITAL EXECUTIVE SYNDICATE,  
Trustee, Hajji A.R. Ahmad  
5538 W. Thompson St  
Phila., Pa 19131  
215-877-7452

*the Hope Family  
Hajji A.R. Ahmad*  
THE HOPE FAMILY, Trustee,  
Hajji A.R. Ahmad  
5538 W. Thompson St  
Phila., Pa 19131

*Rashid Omar Ibn Ali*  
RASHID OMAR IBN ALI  
5538 W. Thompson St  
Philadelphia, Penna 19131

*Sheila M. Levy*  
SHEILA M. LEVY

*Maria Johnson*  
MARIA JOHNSON

*Cynthia Duncan*  
CYNTHIA DUNCAN

*Fatimah Ahmad*  
FATIMAH AHMAD

*Emma Jean Davis*  
EMMA JEAN DAVIS

*Abdul Rahim Karim*  
ABDUL RAHIM KARIM

*L. Mary Ann El-Hary*  
L. MARY ANN EL-HARY

*Karima Ahmad*  
KARIMA AHMAD

*Hajji A.R. Ahmad*  
HAJJI A.R. AHMAD  
5538 W. Thompson St  
Phila., Pa 19131  
215-877-7452